

**FA1-00612-1 University of California, Irvine - CIRM Institute****Facilities Working Group Score: 80****Requested Funding: \$37,000,000****Recommended Funding: \$29,600,000**

Possible points →	Value 25	Leverage 25	Urgency 20	Shared Res 15	Functionality 15
FWG Score: 80	22	13	19	13	13

PROPOSAL:

The applicant proposes construction of a new three-story stem cell research facility that will consolidate basic and discovery research, preclinical research and preclinical development, and clinical research programs. The facility will include a stem cell culture core, a videoconferencing center, and clinical/human performance and regulatory functions associated with clinical activities. In addition to typical biochemistry research laboratories, the building will include outpatient clinical space to facilitate interaction among researchers in all three areas of investigation.

The CIRM Institute consists of 38,907 assignable square feet (asf) and 61,575 gross square feet (gsf) at a total cost of \$60,907,000. The applicant seeks CIRM funding of \$37,000,000. The project will co-locate investigators and expand research capacity. A portion of the applicant's stem cell research team is currently located off campus in leased facilities. At occupancy, the facility will house 16 research teams (PIs), of which six will be new to the institution. The applicant also noted space will be available for 10 visiting researchers. A sub-grade level shell space will be considered for full funding by the applicant to accommodate future expansion needs. This shell space is not included in the CIRM proposal. Completion of the project is scheduled for July 2010.

COST:**Cost Summary Table**

Cost Category	Total Amount	Amount/PI*
Building	\$55,753,000	\$3,484,563
Group 2 Equipment	\$5,154,000	\$322,125
Total	\$60,907,000	\$3,806,688
Requested CIRM Amount	\$37,000,000	\$2,312,500
Applicant Amount	\$23,907,000	\$1,494,188

* Based on number of PIs included in the Part 1 Capacity/Use table

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES WORKING GROUP REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

The reviewer indicated that the proposal was very good and strong.

Value—The reviewer stated that he thought the planned use of a design-build delivery procedure was notable. He noted it was innovative and that few applicants had employed this delivery method, which should result in a shorter schedule and lower costs. The working group discussed the efficiency of the proposal, in particular the fact that the design of this building will duplicate an existing facility.

Leverage—The reviewer found that the only weakness of this proposal was low leverage. It was noted, however, that shell space to be constructed by the campus at its own expense had not been included in leverage, although other applicants had included such shell space in calculating leverage. One reviewer noted that from a real estate perspective, it is always a good idea to create shell space and that even if it was not included in the applicant's leverage calculation, he encouraged the FWG to include the value of the shell space (\$3.1 million) in assigning a leverage score. The applicant also noted that an additional \$1.5 million for planned equipment had not been included in its calculation of leverage, and that it would also invest funds associated with future faculty recruitments that were difficult to estimate at this time, and therefore were also excluded from its leverage calculation.

Urgency—The reviewer commented favorably on the applicant's highly qualified staff and its commitment to and experience with the design-build methodology. He indicated that he was highly confident that the applicant could deliver the project as envisioned.

Shared Resources—The applicant indicated that the proposed facility will house 16 research teams and 10 visiting teams in order to provide opportunities for collaboration on a national and international basis. The FWG discussed at length the numbers of resident and visiting researchers and the inclusion of visiting researchers in the analysis of the proposal.

Functionality—The reviewer indicated that the building was well planned, very functional and will provide excellent synergistic space for all building occupants. In discussing the laboratory planner's grades of B for functionality and B for value, the FWG asked the planner how an applicant could achieve an A rating. He replied that he reserved the A rating for proposals that raised the bar as compared to all applicants. He further explained that an A grade was limited to only a very few proposals because their programs did something very different and innovative that would create a more creative or inspiring space. He stated that this applicant has a solid building plan that has been tested, has highly useable space with the appropriate components. He concluded that it did not, however, have any inspiring or unique features. The FWG noted that the inclusion of clinical space in the facility would increase interactions between clinicians, patients and bench researchers, and that this application is unique in including this opportunity for a direct patient-researcher connection.

The FWG score for this application was 80. During programmatic review, the FWG voted to recommend funding of \$29,600,000, representing 80 percent of the requested CIRM amount of \$37 million.